

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Discussion Paper on FTE Relief

FROM:

C/HRPS/OP
1012 Ames

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

9 Feb 82

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. DD/OP-PA&E
1006 Ames

2. EA/OP
5 E 58 Hqs

3. DD/OP
5 E 58 Hqs

4. D/OP
5 E 58 Hqs

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

1 to 3:

Ben:

Part I of the 22 January tasking from John McMahon is attached. Stan's analysis makes a very firm case for seeking FTE relief. Stan has discussed his findings with [redacted] and Dave concedes that it is difficult to plan on his "windfall." When we discuss this, Dave would like to join us. Stan's analysis should also be useful for the forthcoming Comptroller's meeting.

We will have part II on SIS ceiling increases to you by the end of the week.

Pete
Pete

FaTEful Decisions on FTE

(Discussion Paper on Relief from FTE Ceiling)

Early in FY 1982, the first year of Agency compliance with the new FTE ceiling controls imposed by OMB and OPM, it was anticipated that the Agency might exceed its FTE ceiling for full-time permanent personnel and also the corresponding ceiling for part-time intermittent personnel. As some uncertainty attached to the estimate of retirements expected during December and January, which are now major months for retirements, it was decided to assess the situation after the facts were available for those months. In the meantime, a thoughtful background paper was prepared by Gary Chase in OGC laying out the concepts, the DOD exemption, and options available to Agency management. At this time, it is useful to carry the staff work further and to reassess the impact of FTE ceiling on the Agency.

Under pressure to staff immediately for expanded program responsibilities, the Agency has had a rapid buildup in the early months of FY 1982. The trend extrapolation for FTE use shows that we may exceed the allocation for part-time and intermittent employees by [] many years. Based on our estimates of separations and EODs of full-time permanent employees, we could exceed the FTP ceiling for FTE by another [] many years. If constrained by current position ceiling [] we would exceed the FTP ceiling by [] many years. (Table 1)

Given the present level of full-time permanent employees and the corresponding present level of part-time intermittent employees, if we were forced to live with the FTE ceiling for both categories, we could not expand our staff beyond the present level. (Table 2) This would leave us at least [] below our position ceiling for yearend! (A strength [] compared to position ceiling of [] See Table 3 for the computation.)

This grim conclusion stems from a few key facts. FTE Biweekly Trend Report #8 projects a yearend overconsumption of FTE of [] many years for part-time intermittent employees. The anticipated picture is no better for full-time permanent employees. A gradual rise to position ceiling from the present level, given anticipated losses and projected accessions that are less than our present capability, would overexpend another [] many years. If the overage in part-time intermittent FTE were to be absorbed by full-time permanent FTE, we could only stay near combined FTE ceiling by holding our ceiling-count (FTP) strength to [] as compared with a strength [] at the end of January.

S-E-C-R-E-T

It is apparent from this analysis that we require both relief from FTE ceiling and additional funding for the equivalent of at least [] manyears. Without this, we would be forced to curtail immediately the Agency's expansion and to hold future FTP accessions to a level that replaced losses, that is, an average of [] a month, or less than 50% of current capability to supply FTP EODs! The other alternative, which would be to offset decreases in part-time intermittent personnel with increases in full-time permanent personnel does not appear to be practical since the offsets would have to be in different Directorates.

Any slowdown in the recruiting effort over the next eight (8) months would have grave adverse impact on our ability to regain recruiting momentum to meet the expanded requirements in the Budget projections for FY 1983. The unfilled positions, largely in the DDI, DDA, and DDO, would severely hamper fulfillment of mission responsibilities.

Whether the Agency obtains additional FTE ceiling or relief from the control of FTE ceiling, it will probably have a funding problem. Funds for [] manyears would be required additionally to cover the part-time intermittent overage and to permit reaching the position ceiling.

Analysis by [] in the Office of the Comptroller suggests that there is a cushion (or "windfall" as he terms it) amounting to some [] manyears of FTP FTE that is not recorded in the official accounting of FTE. Such a cushion arises from the fact that some categories of employees are shown against strength but not paid; the most notable category being employees in the first 30 days of LWOP. He had previously estimated a higher figure for this cushion. This Staff has done an alternative calculation that comes closer to [] We are not very confident about counting on this cushion for planning purposes. There may be seasonal factors that affect it. Further, there are proposals now for changes in benefits to employees on LWOP that would considerably reduce the value of going on LWOP rather than separating.

[]
C/HRPS/OP

Next 4 Page(s) In Document Exempt